

problems and acknowledge that we have got to do better. The other thing is, I think it is very difficult to be able to tell other countries when they are speaking the language of family planning that they can not get funding for HIV/AIDS, part of family planning is to save lives of women who may be infected with HIV/AIDS.

Truly we have a crisis, and I believe having gone to Africa in the first presidential trip in the term of the administration of President Clinton when we went and traveled to countries like Zambia, South Africa and Botswana, we saw what Africa could do. Now we know that they can do a lot with generic drugs. Distribution questions can be answered. I would simply say, Mr. Speaker, that it is imperative that we fight this battle together, link arms together to ensure that we do not orphan any more children around the world.

Let me close by saying, Mr. Speaker, by saying this is a problem right in our own back yard. And I ask HHS to make sure that the minority fund for minorities that are fighting HIV/AIDS in our respective communities get to those minority agencies here in America. Because I hear over and over again, wherever I go, that those funds designated by the Congressional Black Caucus are not getting to those inner-city agencies and nonprofits to fight HIV/AIDS rights in our backyard. This is an issue for the President. The Global AIDS Fund is an issue for the President and the administration, and I hope that we can collectively work together because we should be committed to saving lives.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for her statement and for her leadership and for her patience on this special order.

Let me yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), and I want to thank her also for her participation and her leadership this evening.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, quickly, I want to thank the gentlewoman for her sustained leadership on this issue.

I want to focus on one issue and that is the failure to use multilateralism when it comes to AIDS policy. The unilateral approach we see here that we do not have a global approach to AIDS any more than we have the kind of global approach we need to war and to terrorism. In both, lives are at stake. The Global AIDS Fund is applauded all over the world because it is a low cost administered fund with great accountability, philanthropists serve on it. And what have we done?

It is not clear whether we are setting up a new fund, a new entity. What is clear is we are giving only a billion dollars rather than the more than \$2 billion that should go to that fund, so where is the rest of our money going to? Why are not we using this multilateral approach which would get the most bang for our dollar?

I think the reason is we do not want to play by the same rules that the rest

of the world is playing by. We want the global gag rule and the way to make sure we get a global gag rule is to pull our money out and deal with our money ourselves. That is a tragedy to take the gag rule and apply it to AIDS treatment.

Imagine in Africa what AIDS means. It means a terrible stigma that you cannot get treatment in the same place that you get family planning is going to mean that many people will not get treatment at all. We want unilateralism here to do what we tried to do with the Asian countries when we were recently discussing HIV prevention. We tried to delete the mention even of condoms there. We are trying to unilaterally impose our approach, an approach that we have imposed in our country, but democratically you can do that here, we are trying to impose that on the world. That is why we were seeing unilateralism here even as we have even unilateralism in much foreign policy since this President came into office. Lives are at risk. I ask that we go global when it comes to AIDS. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia for her participation and for her leadership.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

#### EMERGENCY PLAN FOR AIDS RELIEF IN AFRICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCOTTER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Water) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, AIDS activists and interesting, caring legislators and others have been working on this AIDS issue for the past 20 years. President Bush did not get active on this issue over the past 2 years, but he has come to the table now to talk about emergency plan for AIDS relief in Africa. And according to the administration, this proposal will provide \$15 billion for global HIV/AIDS programs over the next 5 years, including \$10 billion in brand new money.

Now, we have to take a very close look at this here proposal. A closer look at the President's budget for fiscal year 2004 indicates that it may not be a pure \$15 billion that will be spent over the next 5 years.

One would think that \$15 billion over 5 years would amount to \$3 billion per year. However, the administration's budget for global AIDS programs for

fiscal year 2004 is only \$2 billion. An increase of just half a billion over the fiscal year 2003 level. Administration officials have indicated that they plan to phase in the proposed funding over the next 5 years. Phasing in funds is particularly troublesome in the case of the AIDS epidemic. Every year, another 3 million people die of AIDS, another 5 million become infected with HIV. How many people will we have to have die before we have an emergency plan, a real emergency plan that is triggered immediately?

The President promised that his proposed emergency plan for AIDS relief would provide \$10 billion in new money for global AIDS programs. When we look at this and upon close attention, it becomes very clear that the administration is transferring money from other development assistance accounts in order to fund this new proposal. The President's budget for fiscal year 2004 severely underfunds one of the Federal government's most important development assistance accounts, the Child Survival and Health Account.

Funding for this account was cut by \$470 million, relative to the fiscal year 2003 level. Indeed, when you combine the President's proposed increase of half a billion dollars for global AIDS programs with his proposed cuts of almost half a billion dollars in the Child Survival and Health Account, the total funding for the two programs is virtually identical to fiscal year 2000 funding. Cutting funds for Child Survival and Health in order to fund AIDS relief is no way to improve global health.

Another problem with the proposal in this plan for AIDS relief is that it virtually eliminates funding for the global fund to fight AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria. The global fund encourages developing countries to combine the efforts of government agencies, nongovernmental organizations and civil society into a comprehensive strategy to fight epidemics in a manner appropriate for local needs and conditions. The global fund also allows donors to pool their resources so that developing countries do not have to deal with as many funding agencies.

Now, the President's proposal of \$15 billion over 5 years for global AIDS program includes only \$1 billion for the Global Fund. The President's budget provides only \$200 million for the global fund in fiscal year 2004 and presumably \$200 million per year over the next 5 years.

This will drastically reduce the Global Fund's activities which received \$400 million from the United States this year alone. The President is apparently determined to ensure that his \$15 billion emergency plan for AIDS relief will be implemented almost exclusively by the United States government agencies, Jeffrey Sacks, the Chairman of the World Health Organization's Commission on Macroeconomics and Health evaluated the President's proposal and concluded, "The U.S., as it is wont these days, has decided to go it alone."